



## ***LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT***

REGULAR MEETING APRIL 16, 2012  
AGENDA ITEM 7b

---

BAR CASE No.: THLP-2011-0013  
Reviewer: Christopher Murphy, Zoning Administrator  
Address: 104 Loudoun Street, LLC.  
Zoning: B-1, H-1 Overlay District  
Applicant/Owner: PR Construction  
Architect: T.J. Gilbride Architects, Inc  
Builder: PR Construction

**BAR Public Hearing:** The public hearing was held at the BAR's Regular Business Meeting on March 19, 2012. The BAR deferred the vote on the application in order to discuss matters raised during the public hearing at a work session, including:

- Location of the driveway with a single parking space in front of building
- Location of the primary entrance/lack of a door in front façade
- Lack of a raised foundation
- Installing shutters on windows on the side elevations
- Examination of the massing of the building – provide an elevation drawing showing the proposed building compared with its adjoining buildings on 102 and 106 Loudoun Street
- Possibility of placing a stoop on the Loudoun Street elevation for a door on that façade

**BAR Worksession:** The items identified above were discussed at the worksession on April 9<sup>th</sup>.

- Location of the driveway with a single parking space in front of building

The Applicant expressed his intention to continue the use of this space as a driveway for temporary parking – suggesting posting the space 15 minute parking only – for use by occupants of the building, but not for long-term parking. Staff mentioned that the Applicant will more than likely have problems at Site Plan review obtaining permission to use this space as a driveway due to limited site distance. As a result, this may require some design change that could require the Applicant returns to the BAR for approval of that change.

- Location of the primary entrance/lack of a door in front façade

The Applicant submitted revised drawings depicting an entry door on the front (south) façade of the building. This door was shown in the western most bay of the façade. Staff questioned whether this location or a central location is more suitable along this façade. In addition, staff questioned whether or not the proposed door surround is appropriate to the style or architecture being emulated by the front portion of the building. The BAR, expressed it was happy to see the

addition of the door on the front façade and that they had no preference whether it was centered or located as illustrated on the April 2 plan set. Regarding the door surround, the BAR found the proposed surround to be acceptable.

- Lack of a raised foundation

The Applicant's revised plan set dated April 2 shows a raised foundation 1' 1¾" in height brick apron. The BAR questioned how the Applicant proposed to meet the Brick apron to the stucco walls. It was resolved that the brick will extend out from the plain of the wall approximately ¼ inch.

- Installing shutters on windows on the side elevations

The April 2 revised plan set shows same panel shutters on hinges with shutter dogs on the east and west facades of the front portion of the building as shown on the front (south) façade. The BAR expressed its satisfaction with this revision.

- Examination of the massing of the building – provide an elevation drawing showing the proposed building compared with its adjoining buildings on 102 and 106 Loudoun Street.

Staff expressed concern with the mass of the proposed building illustrated in the elevation drawing showing 102, 106 Loudoun Street as well as the Norris House. Staff also questioned whether the proposed building presents a vertical expression and whether a vertical expression is appropriate in a Georgian or Federal style building on this block of downtown. The BAR had no concern with the mass of the proposed building pointing to the fact that the block displays a variety of architectural styles and expressions, and the proposed building will not be more massive than some of the buildings on the south side of this block of Loudoun Street.

- Possibility of placing a stoop on the Loudoun Street elevation for a door on that façade

The door proposed on the April 2 plan set is illustrated as recessed into the façade without a stoop that extends into the right-of-way, so there is no more concern with this design. Staff did include in the staff report for the April 9 worksession meeting the Town Code prohibition of new permanent encroachments into rights-of-way. (Leesburg Town Code Sections 30-33 and 30-35)

- Style of the proposed balconies on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors of the rear (north) façade of the building.

The April 2 revised plan set redesigned the style of the balconies from the original style emulating more of a deep south style versus the colonial style typical of the architectural style applied in Northern Virginia being emulated by the proposed building. The new balconies were still proposed to be constructed a wrought iron powder coated. The BAR suggested that instead of wrought iron wood is a more appropriate material.

**New Plan Set Submission:** The Applicant submitted new plans on April 11 revising the April 2 plan set dated April 10. The changes illustrated in the April 10 plan set include the following:

- Sheet A1.1: The First Floor is now shown as open suites intended for non-residential occupancy. This change was made as a result of TLZO 9.3.15.B. that specific open space and recreation facilities for multi-family developments exceeding densities of 8 dwelling units per acre.
- Sheet A1.1: A note has been added showing the recessed door on the western façade as being the ADA compliant entrance to the building
- Sheets A1.1 & A2.1: The door on the front (south) façade has been centered on that façade. All other details of that door regarding design and materials remain unchanged.
- Sheets A2.2 & A2.3: The note describing the balconies now reads, "painted porch rail & balusters w painted bracket (typ of 2)" No other details have been submitted that verify these balconies will be wood.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION/DRAFT MOTION

(Based on the BAR's discussion at the meeting, any changes to the language of either part of the motion should be incorporated as necessary.)

Based on the fact that:

The Applicant has satisfactorily addressed all items of concern relating to the present application and, as a result, the application is in compliance with the H-1 Design Guidelines for new construction.

To date no information has been presented to the BAR regarding specific materials and colors to be used on the building.

Staff recommends approval of TLHP-2012-0013 contingent upon BAR approval of building materials and colors to be used on the building.